

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed October 1, 2007. At the time of the Final Office Action, Claims 1, 4-10 and 21-32 were pending in this Application. Claims 1, 4-10 and 21-32 were rejected. Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 21, and 25-32 have been amended. Claims 2-3 and 11-20 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 25 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0078597 by Ray Sun et al. ("*Sun*").

For example, regarding amended Claim 1, the Examiner stated:

The Applicant argues that Sun does not teach "activating a deactivated wireless network security". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Fig. 4 step 410 and associated text, wherein paragraph [0044] the user is interpreted to have deactivate network security until it logged onto the new network. The security is not activated, therefore it is interpreted by the Examiner to be deactivated. Authenticating through log on in interpreted to be activating the wireless security." (Final Office Action, pages 9-10).

Applicants still disagree that Figure 4 and Paragraph [0044] of *Sun* (as well as the rest of *Sun*) disclose the elements of Claim 1 prior to the current amendments. For example, Applicants maintain that Paragraph [0044] discusses a process for a user to log in to a network according to a PEAP authentication protocol, which is fundamentally different from activating a deactivated wireless network security for a wireless network, as recited in Claim 1. Nothing in Paragraph [0044] indicates that the network has a "deactivate network security until [the user] logged onto the new network." Further, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's statement that "Authenticating through log on in interpreted to be activating the wireless security." Authenticating a user attempting to login to a network is clearly not the same as activating a deactivated security system. Simply stated, there is nothing in Paragraph [0044], nor the remainder of *Sun*, that discloses activating a deactivated wireless network security for a wireless network.

However, despite Applicants' view that *Sun* clearly does not disclose the elements of Claim 1, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to further highlight certain distinctions between Claim 1 and *Sun*. For instance, amended Claim 1 recites, in part:

1. A method for activating a wireless network security with a wireless host, comprising:

in a wireless network having a deactivated wireless network security for the wireless network such that at least a first wireless client and a second wireless client can access the wireless network without authentication, a wireless host establishing a communication connection with the first client;

...

as a result of determining that the received identifier code from the first client matches the unique key-code maintained by the wireless host, the wireless host activating the deactivated wireless security network for the wireless network such that the second client cannot access the wireless network without authentication.

(emphasis added)

Sun does not teach these elements. Even if *Sun* disclosed activating wireless network security for a particular wireless client in response to the client requesting activation of the wireless network security, as suggested by the Examiner (which Applicants do not agree), *Sun* fails to disclose activating wireless network security for a second client in response to a first client requesting activation of the wireless network security, as recited in amended Claim 1. More particularly, *Sun* fails to teach a first client communicating a unique key-code to a host in order to activate wireless network security for a second client, such the after such activation of the security system, the second client cannot access the wireless network without authentication.

For at least the reasons above, *Sun* does not disclose all elements of amended Claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of amended Claim 1, as well as Claims 4-10 that depend from Claim 1.

In addition, for analogous reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of amended independent Claims 25 and 30, as well as Claims 26-29 and 31-32 that depend therefrom.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Dependent Claims 4-10, 21-24, 26-29, and 31-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sun* and further in view of various references.

Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable over the cited combinations at least because they depend from amended independent Claims 1, 25, and 30, shown above to be allowable. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of dependent Claims 4-10, 21-24, 26-29, and 31-32.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

Applicants respectfully submit a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) Transmittal. The Commissioner is authorized to charge the fee amount of \$810.00 to Deposit Account 50-2148 in order to effectuate this filing.

Applicants believe there are no other fees due at this time. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2148 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2689.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorney for Applicants



Eric M. Grabski
Reg. No. 51,749

Date: December 4, 2007

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

CUSTOMER NO. **23640**

512.322.2689

512.322.8383 (fax)